REMARKS

CLAIMS

Claims 1, 3-7, 9, 18-21, 24-35 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

ART BASED REJECTIONS

In the office action, claims 1-3, 9-15, 18-21, 23-34 and 36-37 were rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Getting Results with Microsoft Office Results 97 pages 448-457, 563-573, and new pages 169-178 (collectively hereafter Office Results 97). It should be noted that the office action inadvertently rejects claims that have been previously cancelled. Claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable presumably over Office Results 97. Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Office Results 97 in view US patent application publication number 2004/0075683 (hereafter "Savage"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

Independent Claim 1 reads as follows:

accessing **a relational abstraction of a data store**, the relational abstraction including a plurality of views, scalar or aggregate fields associated with the views, relations between the views, and **a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations, wherein the metadata layer is separate from the views**;

receiving an indication <u>from a user of a base view from among one or more views in the relational abstraction</u>; and

providing a user interface for <u>the user</u> creating a customized report that includes at least one drill link,

wherein creating the customized report comprises

**presenting to the user a selection including only fields
constrained by the base view based upon the one or more objects in
the metadata layer**, and

providing the user at least **one drill link on a field
constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based
upon a relation path from the base view determined from the one or
more objects in the metadata layer**.

Several of these recited features are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references.

Specifically, there is no disclosure in Office Results 97 of the (1) **a relational abstraction of a data store**, the relational abstraction including a plurality of views, scalar or aggregate fields associated with the views, relations between the views, and **a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations, wherein the metadata layer is separate from the views.**

Nor does Office Results 97 disclose or suggest an interface for creating a customized report **(2) presenting to the user a selection including only fields constrained by the base view based upon the one or more objects in the metadata layer** or (3) **providing** the user at least **one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer**. None of these features are disclosed or suggested by the applied references. As disclosed in the specification, a user selected base view is becomes the entry point into the relational abstraction and is used to constrain which fields are displayed for selection by a user and which relations of the relational abstraction (i.e., a relation path) can be followed to select the fields including the field designated as drill link. See, for example, page 14, lines 1-12; page 23, lines 4-20; page 31, line 14 to page 33, line 13.

As noted in the office action, Office Results 97 discloses displaying pivot table views of a database but this does not disclose receiving an indication of a base view from

among one or more views in *a relational abstraction* that includes not only *a plurality of views, scalar or aggregate fields associated with the views, relations between the views*, and but <u>also *a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations* **where the metadata layer is separate from the views**</u>. That is, there is simply no disclosure in Office Results 97 of anything that reads on the claimed metadata layer which is separate from the views.

Furthermore, the office action states that "Office teaches a wizard for generation of a pivot table report which has a drop down button to discover the data hidden in a database from one user in the view to another user(s) in the database which example allows you to view the summary for each salesperson found in the database in a company *in accordance to the categories designed into the table report*." Therefore, Office Report 97 teaches categories designed into the table report as the logical basis on which the reports are generated. This is in sharp contrast to the claimed report <u>**(2) presenting to the user a selection** including only fields constrained by the base view **based upon the one or more objects in the metadata layer**</u>. In fact, no such selection based upon objects in the metadata layer is presented to a user in the creation of a customized report.

Nor does Office Results 97 disclose anything related to the providing the user at least **one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view <u>determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer</u>**. As noted earlier herein, the entire disclosure of Office Results 97 appears to relate to category logic designed or based on the table reports and nowhere does Office Results 97 teach or suggest providing drill links that are constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from a base view determined by one or more objects in the metadata layer. In fact, no such metadata layer is disclosed by Office Results and, therefore, any processing based on a determination therefrom is not taught or suggested by Office Results 97.

In this context it should be noted that the **<u>metadata layer</u>** <u>includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relations **(but are not the views or data store themselves)**. That is, generating a pivot table report based on the view itself (as disclosed by Office Results 97) does not disclose</u>

anything corresponding to the claimed drill link being constrained by a separate metadata layer of the relational abstraction as recited in independent claim 1. Nor is there anything in the disclosure of Office Results 97 which corresponds to the drill link being based upon a relation path from a base view.

It should be noted that *silence* in a reference is not a proper basis for asserting that reference either anticipates or renders obvious a claimed feature. The Federal Courts have held for a long time that The Patent Office (PTO) has the burden of proving each of the claimed features is shown by the prior art. An allegation that claimed subject matter is "obvious" requires a positive, concrete teaching in the prior art, such as would lead a person skilled in the art to choose the claimed combination from among many that might be comprehended by broad prior art teachings. The PTO's review court has made it very clear that silence in a reference is hardly a substitute for clear and concrete evidence from which a conclusion of obviousness might justifiably flow. See, e.g., *Application of Burt*, 356 F.2d 115, 121 (CCPA 1966).

Furthermore, the deficiencies in Office Results 97 is not cured by any of the other applied references. Specifically, Savage is cited for this teaching of creating graphical reports using SVG format but does not disclose anything related to the features (1)-(3) discussed earlier herein. Accordingly, several of the features recited in independent claim 1 are not disclosed or suggested by the applied references. Therefore, independent claim 1 is believed to patentable over the applied references.

Independent claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, (1) accessing a relational abstraction of a data store, wherein the metadata layer is separate from the views; (2) providing a user interface for creating a first report containing at least one drill link, wherein creating the first report comprises including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction based upon the one or more objects in the metadata layer, and (3) providing the at least one drill link on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer.

As discussed earlier herein with respect to claim 1, Office Results 97 does not disclose or suggest anything related to these features. Since these recited features are not disclosed by any of the applied references, independent claim 21 is believed to be patentable over the applied references.

Independent claims 34 recites a system that includes, *inter alia*, (1) means for accessing a relational abstraction of a data store ...<u>wherein the metadata layer is separate from the views</u>, (2) means for providing a user interface for creating a report that includes at least one drill link including (i) means for including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction <u>based upon the one or more objects in the metadata layer</u>,, and (ii) means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view <u>determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer</u>. As discussed with respect to similar features recited in claim 1, these features are not disclosed or suggested by any of the applied references. Accordingly, independent claim 34 is patentable over the applied references.

Independent claim 35 recites a system that includes, *inter alia*, that (1) means for accessing a relational abstraction of a data store, the relational abstraction including ...a metadata layer that includes one or more objects that contain properties describing the data store, the views, the fields, and the relation<u>, wherein the metadata layer is separate from the views</u>, (2) means for providing a user interface for creating a first report containing at least one drill link including (i) means for including only fields constrained by a base view in the relational abstraction <u>based upon the one or more objects in the metadata layer</u>, and (ii) means for providing the at least one drill link only on a field constrained by the metadata layer of the relational abstraction based upon a relation path from the base view <u>determined from the one or more objects in the metadata layer</u>. As discussed with respect to similar features recited in claim 1, these features are not disclosed or suggested by any of the applied references. Accordingly, independent claim 35 is patentable over the applied references.

DEPENDENT CLAIMS

The dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims on which they ultimately depend. In addition, they recite additional patentable features when considered as a <u>whole.</u> It should be noted that the remarks herein with respect to the patentability of the independent claim(s), render the remaining rejections moot. Therefore, these rejections have not been separately addressed at this stage but applicants retain the right to do so at a later stage should it become necessary

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendment and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. An indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the Applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

If this response is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicants hereby request any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.

Respectfully submitted,

Microsoft Corporation

Date: September 9, 2008

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/

Aaron C. Chatterjee, Reg. No.: 41,398
Attorney for Applicants
Direct telephone (425) 706-7453
Microsoft Corporation
One Microsoft Way
Redmond WA 98052-6399

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION
(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

September 9, 2008
Date

/Noemi Tovar/
Signature

Noemi Tovar
Printed Name

Type of Response: Amendment
Application Number: 10/765,232
Attorney Docket Number: 310480.01
Filing Date: 01/26/2004